

Draft Minutes
5th Neskowin CPAC Steering Committee
Neskowin Valley School
1:00pm – 4:30pm

Members present: Lyle Rowland, Pam Rowland, Carol Bickford, Deborah Wright, Tim Gordon, Bob Conklin, Jack Bertell, Doug MacCourt, Phil Anderson, Meyeong Anderson, and Guy Sievert

Staff present: Lisa Phipps, Coastal Resource Planner

Jack opened the meeting shortly after 1:00pm. Jack outlined the agenda for today: review contact spreadsheet, approval of June 3, 2006 minutes (handed out by Lisa at the meeting), review bylaw changes, complete bylaw review, get document to County Counsel, determine initial nominating committee, set 1st meeting

Jack said that three prominent locations needed to be identified to post notices. He reminded the group that Laurie Webber agreed to allocate space at her office for postings. Contacts still need to be made with the Post Office and the market. Carol said that one of the primary purposes of the bulletin board at the Post Office is for land use issues.

There was also discussion on who to include on the email list for this committee. It was decided that everyone who had expressed an interest in being informed of the process would be on the list.

The group then reviewed the minutes of the June 3, 2006 meeting. Lisa reminded the group that the minutes only reflected the time she was present at the meeting. She was waiting for a copy of the minutes taken after she left. The following changes were made to the 6/3/06 minutes: 8th paragraph should begin: "It began with discussion about the land use committee formed under the Community Plan. Andreas expressed concern that this would duplicate those efforts."; same paragraph – replace "He" with "Andreas" in the following sentence "He also expressed concern that the Community Plan is not addressed in the Bylaws."; the following sentence should read "Guy state the group has been told by the County that the Vision Plan has ambiguous language that needs to be ..."; in the 10th paragraph, second sentence: "...Bob expressed concerns about extending the boundary beyond the Community Growth Boundary (CGB) since those people were not notified of the first community meeting outside of the CGB; others thought the area of influence and the membership boundary should be synonymous; other comments were that expanding the CGB would be more inclusive."; the acronym for the Community Growth Boundary was incorrect and was corrected in the document; the fourth sentence from the bottom of the 10th paragraph should read "The new motion replaced Neskowin Community Growth Boundary with Neskowin Creek Watershed Boundary."; in the 12th paragraph, second to last sentence, it should read "The vote was 9-2 because there was concern that there was too much detail for the bylaws (Bob and Guy opposed).

There was a discussion on how to vote on the minutes as they are not complete. The group decided to wait until the minutes were whole – edits will be taken over email or at a next meeting if one is held.

The group then moved on to the bylaws. There was some confusion about insertions made by Lisa. She explained that there were requests for options on language for various sections and her insertions were underlined to distinguish them from the original text. Guy asked how members are protected from lawsuits. Lisa said that the committees will be protected under the County umbrella as long as the group was acting in good faith. Discussion concluded that could be defined working within the parameters and mission of the committee. The group requested that Lisa provide a copy of the insurance policy language that affords the committees that protection. Doug gave an example of general language that may be in the policy. He said that the records of meetings and actions have to reflect the action is consistent with laws. It was also noted that some people obtain their own insurance and homeowner policies may also have a rider that can be activated to provide additional protection. Lisa said she would check with Counsel and provide the group with the material Counsel gives to her.

The group then moved onto the Bylaws. There was a good deal of discussion on the “Committees” section. Some comments included: how to people get on the committees, does the chair have enough latitude to appoint, other members should be able to initiate the need for a committee, Roberts Rules of Order addresses this issue, providing diversity on a committee will be the biggest challenge and the most important aspect to the committees, should there be a minimum/maximum number of committee people, need to remember that the committee makes a recommendation to the whole group, and a good chair will make sure diversity is present particularly on the ad hoc committees. Doug made a motion and Guy seconded that the statement should read “The Chair shall seek to appoint...” The vote was unanimous. Guy said that the purpose of the CPAC is to have a community discussion, involve all viewpoints, and make the best recommendations based upon that.

There was discussion on the “District” section. Several members stated that the group has already had this discussion. Comments were raised that maybe a statement needed to be included that addresses the CPACs interest in State and federal issues as well and that the CPAC should be noticed on any agency issue that has impact within the boundary. Lisa said that County cannot provide notice for other agencies nor guarantee that other agencies will provide notice. It was decided that the “Purpose” and “Activities” section addresses that issue. By consensus, the “area of influence” was amended to read “area of responsibility”. Carol then brought up that the Neskowin Creek Watershed does not include areas such as Daley Lake or Sahhali Shores. The group said they had discussed this at the last meeting and were going by the title of the map that Gale provided from the Nestucca-Neskowin Watershed Council (created by the Tillamook Estuaries Partnership). Based on Carol’s input, the group agreed that the map should reflect the hydrologic unit and would ask the County to provide the group with a map to reflect to that. Doug made a motion and Deborah seconded to delete the word “creek” and just say Neskowin Watershed Boundary. The decision was unanimous.

Carol brought up concerns about speaking time for members and Guy said that Roberts Rules of Order provided for that.

Pam and Lyle Rowland had to leave at this point.

The group then discussed whether or not a Nominations Committee should be formed. Lisa provided an option of language to use if the group chose to include a Nominations Committee. Guy and Bob said that the purpose of a Nominations Committee is to do their homework, look at the needs of the CPAC, and inform potential candidates of the responsibilities of the positions. It was noted that the group should keep in mind how many committees they are going to form with a limited number of people regularly participating. Doug thought Lisa's piece had the Nominations Committee acting more as a conduit. It was agreed that there did not need to be a single slate to vote on. There was also discussion on how much detail should go into monitoring the committee ie can committee members also be nominated, etc. There was a sentiment that having a Nominations Committee would add a sense of professionalism to the CPAC. After more conversation, it was decided that the group should first determine whether or not they wanted a Nominations Committee. Doug made a motion and Guy seconded: "The Neskowin CPAC shall have a nominations committee as stated in the Bylaws." 6 voted in favor, Doug voted no, and Carol and Jack abstained. The group then looked at making any changes to the wording for the Nominations Committee. It was recommended to take out the second and third paragraph and add the language Lisa provided with some changes and Lisa pointed out that this removed the clause to allow proxy votes. It was stated that at the June 3rd meeting it was a 5-4 vote to include proxy votes. Doug had made the motion and voted for it because of possible concerns with small meetings (attendance-wise). But, it was generally stated that if it was an important issue for people they needed to be in attendance – how could they make informed decisions if they weren't able to hear all of the issues raised at a meeting. A motion was made by Doug and seconded by Deborah to take out the second and third paragraph, replace with language Lisa provided as amended (adding the purpose of the committee and all references to the annual meeting to June from October, and remove the language on how to tally votes(see attachment for all changes))and this includes the removal of the proxy vote. The vote was unanimous to accept the changes.

There was a brief discussion on Conflict of Interest section. Lisa was asked to provide the state's definition of conflict of interest to the group.

There was additional discussion on membership at this point. Bob asked how the CPAC differs from the Neskowin Community Association if the whole community can be a member. The CPAC is an appointed body and created to deal specifically with land use issues. Bob asked about having an executive committee and then an at-large body – he thought a smaller group might help make things happen. The point was made that there was a concern of a small group of people making the decision for everybody. But, then he said he understood that this group had decided to go with direct democracy versus representative democracy.

There was then a vote on accepting the sections of Conflict of Interest, Communications, Meetings, Bylaw Revisions, and Election – Doug made the motion and Bob seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor.

The group then discussed quorum and whether or not a quorum section was necessary. A quorum is the number of people needed to conduct business – in that way it is exclusive of voting. There was discussion on ways to determine quorum. They included a percentage of the membership, set a minimum number, say anything more than one, and should be those in attendance. There was some discussion on whether an officer needed to be present but then it was determined that an officer would always be present to run the meeting. Doug made a motion that the quorum is defined as 3 or more members in attendance at the meeting. Bob seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor. It was said that it is one of the risks of a direct democracy in that sometimes only a few people show up. But it was also noted that any recommendation sent to Staff, the Planning Commission or the Board of Commissioners would reflect the number of people in attendance, the outcome of the vote, and the perspectives present.

It was agreed that Lisa would take responsibility for putting the edits into the Bylaws and she would send it out to the committee for their review and then forward to County Counsel. It was also agreed that additional meetings would be required to set up assignments for the presentation back to the community. The group tentatively scheduled the community meeting for August 26, 2006 with a time and location to be determined. If the Fire Hall is not available, they would consider other dates. Lisa said that a vote would be taken at the community meeting to decide whether the community would officially form a CPAC. If the answer is yes, the first CPAC meeting could be in October.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40pm.